5/21/76

Mr. Tom Susman, counsel
Administrative Practises Subcommittee
U.S.Senate
Washington, D.C.

Dear Tom,

I do not recall whether, when I wrote you a week or so ago, I said I'd send you a set of the documents Howard Roffman had obtained or not. I have received and read them. I have given them to Jim Lesar, with whom I discussed them. If you should desire a set we'll provide it.

They leave no doubt in my mind that the executive branhh used the family and its situation without any serious resistance by those who supposedly represented RFK and the family.

They leave no doubt about a number of other questions ranging from the deliberateness with which Rhoads lied in my suit for pictures of the President's clothing to the official misuse of these arrangements to suppress what the earlier versions of the agreements show RFK did not ask to be suppressed.

Obviously I have no way of knowing what went on then, what was spoken when people met and discussed this but it is also clear that there was an unseemly official rush at several times, with the GSA-Marshall agreement and with what is called the memo of transfer, which came earlier and coincides in time with my first book being in the hands of a publisher later exposed as a CIA publisher.

The manner in which all of this was done together with the unnecessary secrecy has contributed to some of the passionate mythologies. The actual autopsy materials, like the container I assume held the brain and the slides of tissue studies, while included in the memo of transfer, were not in fact transferred in the footlocker in which the other items were held. When I finally received a copy of the memo of transfer these relevant papers were withheld. This led others to hearty denunciations having to do with these objects, Item 9 in the memo.

I do not know what will be within out capabilities but Jim and I have decided to try to use the manner in which my rights with regard to all these papers over to long a period of time - almost ten years - as a means to recover the considerable costs to which I was put and if possible damages. I do not have in mind the provisions of the amended law only.

There is little likelihood those who have received some benefit from this law and who profess interest in it will have anything to do with this but I doubt there will be a case in which the evidence can be as extensive and conclusive. In the long run this will be hurtful to the law. The campaign I saw with the government's reaction to my first case under the amended law is now so clear that Judge Green noted Tuesday that the government is spending more time in needless and clear non-compliance than compliance would require. The time is not far away when the exective agencies will be back before Congress, with support from overburdened judges, demanding amending that will again gut the law. The government is seeing to it that the judges are overburdened. This situation in my C.A.75-1996 is at this point. We have had to make a Vaughn motion, after holding off for months. We have the fifth status call 6/11. To date there has been almost total non-compliance. When there is no public attention to these abuses the government, which has more than strong motive for suppressing what I seek, has nothing to lose and much to gain by stonewalling. A ny-product will be impressive statistics the Hruskas will be able to use in an amending campaign.

Sincerely,
Harold Weisberg